

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

R E M A R K S / A R G U M E N T S

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The June 22, 2005 Office Action and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. In response, claims are amended, and remarks are set forth below in a sincere effort to place the present application in form for allowance. The amendments are supported by the application as originally filed. Therefore, no new matter is added.

Inasmuch as the present Amendment raises no new issues for consideration, and, in any event, places the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for consideration on appeal, its entry under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.116 is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

The courtesies extended by Examiner Patel during a telephonic interview conducted on November 15, 2005 are gratefully appreciated. During the interview, proposed changes to the claims to overcome the prior art of record were discussed.

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,493,387 (Shin et al.) in view of USP 6,148,288 (Park et al.). Claims 6, 9, 11, 12, 15-17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. in view of Park et al., and further in view of USP 6,658,057 (Chen et al.). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. in view of Park et al., and further in view of USP 5,809,139 (Girod et al.).

In response, independent claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 are amended to clarify the invention.

All of the independent claims recite that quality information indicates "distortion of the object" when the bit-stream is truncated during decoding thereof or in relation to a given position in (or a given part of) the bit-stream (see the specification at page 3, lines 3-11 which shows a correspondence between quality and distortion).

All of the independent claims also recite that each coded part includes a header and a data part and that the quality information is added "into the header" (claims 1, 9-13, 15, 17) or is "present in the header" (claim 19). A feature of the present claimed invention is that information about the distortion of an object when the bit-stream representing the

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

object is truncated during decoding is contained in the headers of the coded parts. This feature is explained in the specification, for example, at page 3, lines 12-17.

No new issues are raised by the changes to claims 1, 9-13, 15 and 17) to recite that the quality information is added into the header because claim 19, as previously set forth, recited that the quality information is present in the header and claims 9, 11, 12, 15 and 17 recited that the quality information is extracted from the header, which implies that the quality information is part of the header, i.e., it had been added into the header.

The prior art cited by the Examiner does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the features set forth in the independent claims.

In particular, Shin et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest generating or providing a bit-stream having quality information added into or present in the header of coded parts of the bit-stream as set forth in the independent claims.

In Shin et al., a base layer is encoded into a base layer bit-stream BL and a plurality of bit-streams BSL(0), BSL(1),... As each bit-stream BSL(0), BSL(1) is added to the base layer during decoding, the picture quality of images reproduced from the bit-streams gradually increases. Decoding is terminated when picture quality is deemed adequate. Shin et al. does not mention

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

incorporating quality information, such as the signal-to-noise ratio, into the coded parts of the bit-stream and more specifically, into the headers of the coded parts.

Park describes techniques for coding audio signals into a layered bit-stream having a base layer and a number of enhancement layers. A bit-stream formed using the coding technique includes a header followed by quantization bit information for the base layer or an enhancement layer alternating with coded audio data and quantization step size information for the same layer as the immediately preceding quantization bit information (see Fig. 3). As can be seen in Fig. 3, the coded audio data and quantization step and size information for each layer is not contained in a header of a coded part whereby the coded part, and header thereof, is obtained after the coding (noting that the header in the bit-stream of Park et al. is that box designated "HEADER" which is followed by the data part of the bit-stream which includes coded information).

Park does not mention obtaining coded parts including headers and then adding quality information into the header or providing that quality information is present in the header of such coded parts. The portions of Park noted by the Examiner to allegedly show these features, namely col. 3, lines 44-47, col. 4, lines 22-26 and Fig. 3, do not disclose, teach or suggest a

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

header as part of a coded part obtained after coding and also do not disclose, teach or suggest coded quantization bit information or quantization step size information in the header. Indeed, they do not address the manner in which the coded parts are formed vis-a-vis the addition of distortion information into the headers of the coded parts or the presence of distortion information in the headers.

Chen et al. describes inserting a translucent logo into a bit-stream. The logo is added to an image to be encoded prior to encoding thereof so that a bit-stream is generated which, when decoded, will contain the image and the logo. Chen et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest providing headers of coded parts of a bit-stream with quality information to enable the bit-stream to be decoded, and truncated when desired, in consideration of the quality information contained in the headers.

Accordingly, Shin et al., Park and Chen et al. do not disclose, teach or suggest, when taken either alone or in combination, generating quality information which indicates, e.g., distortion of the object when the bit-stream is truncated during decoding thereof, and adding this quality information into headers of the coded parts of the bit-stream such that the quality information is present therein.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 19 are patentable over Shin et al. in combination with Park under

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

35 USC 103(a) and independent claims 9, 11, 12, 15 and 17 are patentable over Shin et al. in combination with Park and Chen et al. under 35 USC 103(a).

Claims 2-8, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are either directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, claim 13, claim 15 or claim 19 and are patentable over the references of record in view of their dependence on claim 1, claim 13, claim 15 or claim 19 and because the references of record do not disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations set forth in claims 2-8, 14, 16, 18 and 20.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

* * * * *


Entry of this Amendment under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.116, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where there is support for a contrary view.

Appln. No. 09/975,382
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 19, 2005

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert P. Michal
Reg. No. 35,614

November 29, 2005

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101
RPM/ms